



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,271	02/17/2004	Philip C. Hodge	110308-0001	2235
39905	7590	05/01/2007		
ROETZEL AND ANDRESS 222 SOUTH MAIN STREET AKRON, OH 44308			EXAMINER STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/780,271		HODGE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Robert Stevens		2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20061218</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office maintains/withdraws the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC §101 and 102(e), in light of the amendment. However, the Office sets forth new (and maintains previous) rejections of the claims under 35 USC §103(a), in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/18/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks have been stated as beginning on page 31 of the Amendment.

Regarding Applicant's comments on page 31 of the Amendment regarding the previous rejections under 35 USC §§101 and 102(e), the Office has withdrawn these rejections, in light of the amendment.

Applicant provided a detailed description of Applicant's subject matter on pages 32-33. Applicant described and contrasted the Kim reference on page 33, and the Ferguson reference on pages 33-34. Applicant asserts on pages 33-34 that the Ferguson reference does not teach several "limitations" that don't appear to be explicitly claimed (i.e., don't use the same language as in the claims), and that Ferguson does not teach updating links. Applicant also asserts that the cited references are improperly combined because they are "different systems".

The Office respectfully disagrees. First, the contrasted material does not appear to be specifically arguing the recited claim language. As such, Applicant appears to be arguing the general concept of patentability (i.e., that the features upon which Applicant relies are not expressly recited in the rejected claim(s)). Additionally, in response to Applicant's argument that the Kim and Ferguson references are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references are of the same field of endeavor, namely document management.

For at least these reasons, the Office asserts the rejections of the claims as set forth below.

Claim Objections

4. **Claims 1 and 56 are objected to** because of the following informalities: In claims 1 (at line 10) and also in claim 56 (at line 12) the word "and" has been misspelled as "an d". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3-19, 22-34, 36-41 and 43-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0120729, filed as a continuation of Application no. 08/908544, which was filed on Aug. 7, 1997 and published on Jan. 26, 2003, hereafter referred to as "Kim") in view of Ferguson et al. (US Patent No. 6,820,094, filed Oct. 8, 1997 and issued Nov. 16, 2004, hereafter referred to as "Ferguson").

Regarding independent claim 1: Kim discloses

A data-management system to be provided to a digital computer terminal for generating a link in real time between an electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document, said digital computer terminal comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) ***said data-management system comprising: data-capture logic for controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device;*** (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) ***target-document logic for generating said target document from said electronic data;*** ***and*** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) ***link-generating logic for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating said link to said target document in said electronic document in real time;*** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) ***data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device.*** (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach ***wherein said data-management logic automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link***

following said transmission. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store; search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 3: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of top-level directories and subfolders. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 3 and column 4 lines 59-67 in Ferguson, illustrating the use of top-level folder and subdirectories. The specific data one arranged in a hierarchy was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 4: Kim teaches the use of hard disk data storage. (See Figure 1 #3 in Kim, showing a file server computer, it having been well-known in the art that file server computers contain a hard drive.

Regarding claim 5: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claims 7-12: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11 in Ferguson, discussing the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding claim 13: Kim does not explicitly teach link removal. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 7 lines 53-57 in Ferguson, discussing the removal of only the link.)

Regarding claims 15-18: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests the use of an add-in. (See Figure 12 in Ferguson, showing the display results for a browser application add-in.) Ferguson also suggests the use of a data management system. (See the Abstract of Ferguson, discussing a document management application program, it having been an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention as to number of software modules and the location of

Art Unit: 2162

specific functionality in each module.) Ferguson also suggests link-editing/ updating.

(See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing the updating of an STG data storage file.) Ferguson teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to represent links.)

Regarding claim 22: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claims 23-26: Kim does not explicitly teach the recited limitations. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations. (See column 10 lines 9-11, discussing the processing of multipage documents, and column 15 lines 34-40, discussing the linking of a plurality of documents to/from a compound document. Establishing links, whether in a 1:1, 1:MANY, MANY:1 or MANY:MANY fashion, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.)

Regarding independent claim 27: Kim discloses

A data-management system for generating a plurality of links to target documents in an electronic document, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) **said data-management system comprising: means for creating and editing said electronic document; means for generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data captured by a data-capture device;** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) **means for storing said plurality of captured target documents in a computer readable memory; and means for generating a link at a plurality of user-selected locations in said electronic document to said plurality of captured target documents.** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63

Art Unit: 2162

– column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D₁, D₂, etc.].)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 28: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.

Regarding claim 29: Kim teaches “transmitting” documents to storage. (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing storage of documents.) However, Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file,

Art Unit: 2162

in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 31: Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths.

Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Regarding independent claim 32: Kim discloses

A system for linking a target document to a portion of an electronic document in real time (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing automatic link generation to a scanned document file), **said system comprising: a computer application for generating and editing said electronic document;** (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing the use of a scanner and generation of an electronic file.) **link-generating logic operable with said computer application for generating a link to said target document, wherein said target document is an electronic reproduction of a hardcopy document and is to be generated by scanning said hardcopy document with an optical data-capture device, further wherein said link is to be generated at approximately the same time as said captured target document is to be saved,**

and further wherein said computer application is one of a group consisting of a spreadsheet, word processor, database, presentation application, and any combination thereof. (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Ferguson, discussing a browser application and automatic link generation to an HTML page and storage, in context of [0005], discussing the scanning of paper documents using an optical data-capture device such as a scanner. It is noted that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which requires that the file be stored.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach editing. Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding independent claim 33: Kim discloses

A data-management system for linking a portion of an electronic document to a target document, (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing linking an input image) **said data-management system comprising: a data-capture device for capturing electronic data representing an information object;** (See Figure 4 #4 in Kim, showing the use of a scanner.) **means for generating said target document from said electronic data;** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file.) **a computer readable memory to store said target document; and** (See paragraph [0014] in Kim, which discusses the retrieval of the created image file, which required that the file be stored before being retrieved. It is inherent that such data storage required a computer readable memory.) **means for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating a link to said target document in said electronic document.** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) ***means for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device.*** (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach ***wherein said transmitting means automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following transmission.*** Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3

Art Unit: 2162

lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to "the modification of its corresponding document".)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 34: Kim teaches the use of a scanner. (See paragraph [0012] of Kim.)

Claims 36-37 are substantially similar to claims 3-4, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected. It is further noted that the exact "means" (e.g., hardware or software element) in which a particular functionality was implemented, was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding claims 38-39: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding independent claim 40: Kim discloses

An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a link to a target document in a computer application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format) **said method comprising the steps of: generating said target document from electronic data representing an information object captured by a data-capture device; and** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) **substantially simultaneously storing said target document in a computer readable memory and generating said link at said user-selected location in said electronic document.** (See paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation and storage and noting that paragraph [0014] discusses retrieval of the created image file, which inherently required that the file be stored before being retrieved.) ***transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device upon receiving a command***

from a user; (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach **and updating a path of said link to render said link operable after said transmission**. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Regarding claim 41: Kim does not explicitly teach document viewing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See Figure 1 element #169 and column 11 lines 28-32 in Ferguson, discussing document viewing.

Claim 43 is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 44: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Claim 45 is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim 46 is substantially similar to claim 17, and therefore likewise rejected. It is further noted that manual intervention or automatic updating, were obvious variants in light of each other to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding independent claim 47: Kim discloses

An electronic-document management method for creating and managing an electronic document having a plurality of links to target documents in a computer application, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) **said method comprising the steps of: generating a plurality of target documents from electronic data representing one or more information objects captured by a data-capture device;** (See paragraph [0012] in Kim, discussing inputting a document to a scanner or fax and creating a file object.) **generating one or**

more links to the target documents in said electronic document. (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.)

However, Kim does not explicitly teach **editing, generation of a plurality of documents or use of sequential identifiers.** Ferguson, though, suggests editing. (See column 12 lines 8-15 in Ferguson, discussing an edit menu and editing functions.) Ferguson also suggests the generation of a plurality of target documents. (See column 15 lines 30-39 in Ferguson, discussing clipped documents being formed from a plurality of documents such as images, Word documents and HTML files, and column 15 line 63 – column 16 line 6, discussing links to a compound document from each component target document.) Ferguson further suggests the use of sequential identifiers for targets. (See column 5 lines 1-15 in Ferguson, discussing the sequential numbering of documents [e.g., D₁, D₂, etc.])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Claims 48-49 are substantially similar to claim 42 and claim 3, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 50: Kim does not explicitly teach printing. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 11 lines 29-32 in Ferguson, discussing a utility for viewing and printing documents.)

Regarding claim 51: Kim does not explicitly teach the use of icons. Ferguson teaches the use of icons. (See column 12 lines 41-52 in Ferguson, discussing the use of icons to represent links.)

Regarding claim 52: Kim does not explicitly teach updating link paths. Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving updates requiring link elimination.)

Regarding claim 53: Kim does not explicitly teach user selected link locations, comparing the number of locations with the number of documents to be linked and generating a link for each document. Ferguson, though, suggests these limitations.

(See column 9 lines 51-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the importing documents, and column 9 lines 27-31, discussing the linking of multiple documents.)

Claims 54-55 are substantially similar to claims 24-25, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding independent claim 56: Kim discloses

A data-management system for generating a hyperlink in real time between a portion of an electronic document opened in a computer application and a target document, (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) **said system comprising: a digital computer terminal comprising a computer readable memory and a data-capture device;** (See Figure 2 #88 and #82 of Kim) **data-capture logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for controlling capture of electronic data by said data-capture device;** (See The Kim Figure 2 #80, 81 and 82, in context of paragraph [0012] discussing the use of a scanner.) **target-document logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for generating said target document from said electronic data;** (See the Abstract of Kim, discussing generation of a target document via a scanning process for display in a

browser.) **link-generating logic in communication with said digital computer terminal for substantially simultaneously storing said target document in said computer readable memory and generating said link to said target document in said electronic document in real time;** (See the Abstract and paragraphs [0012] – [0014] in Kim, discussing automatic link generation between a target and an HTML document opened in a browser application upon scanning a document into a target file digital format. It was an obvious variant to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include more than one link.) ***data-management logic for transmitting said electronic document and said target document to a data storage device.*** (See paragraphs [0013] – [0014] in Kim, discussing the storage of documents.

However, Kim does not explicitly teach ***wherein said data-management logic automatically updates a path of said link to maintain functionality of said link following said transmission.*** Ferguson, though, suggests this limitation. (See column 3 lines 59-65 in Ferguson, discussing updating the STG data storage file, in the context of column 7 lines 47-57, discussing a scenario involving link generation due to “the modification of its corresponding document”.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Ferguson for the benefit of Kim, because to do so provided a user with an efficient way to automatically import, index, categorize, store, search, retrieve, manipulate and archive electronic documents, as taught by Ferguson in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the management of electronic documents.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action..

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Robert Stevens
Examiner
Art Unit 2162

April 25, 2007


MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER